DARPA-BAA-11-72

Frequently Asked Questions

GENERAL INFORMATION

Q: What DARPA seedlings predate this program? Are reports available?
A: There were no preceding efforts.

Q: Are all the presentations available? Will presentations, or, at minimum, the references, from studies and publications be available and/or distributed?
A: Any appropriate presentation material will be made available via the Warrior Web teaming website, https://team.sainc.com/WarriorWeb.

Q: Can a private company submit a request for specific data or a specific correlation study from TAIHOD? Can performers gain access to the TAIHOD database? Are remote user accounts permissible?
A: Any requests for data from TAIHOD will be assessed by TAIHOD personnel on a case by case basis and will be made available solely at their discretion.

PROPOSALS/TEAMING

Q: Can a prime or collaborator be an international company?
A: There is no restriction on the use of overseas performers except where existing US Law is applicable.

Q: Who should we speak with re: ITAR, Patents and Non-US contractors?
A: Please direct any specific questions to DARPA-BAA-11-72@darpa.mil and they will be addressed in turn.

Q: Is subcontracting to a National Lab or Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) permitted?
A: Yes. Proposer should comply with the section on FFRDCs as stated within the BAA.

Q: Are associate contractor agreements expected?
A: These are not expected but can be utilized if necessary at the discretion of the program office.

Q: Due to the "non-grant" nature of this effort, what is the best way for university labs to get involved in this project?
A: Please prepare and submit a proposal following the format provided in the BAA.

Q: To be clear, the complete proposal should include a 1). Baseline and a 2). Option? Can the basic period be divided into a "6 month base" with a demonstration or experiment followed by a 6 month option to complete the base effort?
A: While a 12 month base and 18 month option is the suggested format as per the BAA, a proposer may structure their proposal any way they see fit.

Q: Should the SOW be divided into separate sections for the base period and "options?"
A: The proposer is free to structure their SOW in this fashion; it is viewed as a best practice.

Q: DARPA typically evaluates plans to transition the technology as a key factor – that category is missing in this BAA – will that be addressed in Track "B" or should plans to transition the technology be included now?
A: Transition plans are not an evaluation criteria as per the BAA, and as such are not expected to be addressed in proposals. The evaluation criteria for any subsequent BAAs are TBD.

COST

Q: What is the overall DARPA budget for Warrior Web? Are there funding limits for individual proposals?
A: The investment profile for Warrior Web has not been fixed at this time. The final program will depend on the proposals selected for funding. At this time, no single-project funding limits have been set.

Q: For pricing assumptions, where will the PI meetings be held?
A: PI meetings are assumed to take place near DARPA in Arlington, VA.

Q: Should labor categories, labor hours, and materials and travel be costed on a "per SOW task" basis? Would this format also apply for options?
A: The proposer is free to structure their cost section in this fashion; it is viewed as a best practice.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Q: How will this integrate or compliment the new TECD initiative?
A: This is TBD, but it is hoped that Warrior Web will compliment such a TECD.

Q: Will the benchtop demonstrations be planned at performer's sites?
A: This is an acceptable arrangement.

Q: How many awards are anticipated? Will there be multiple awards in individual technical areas?

A: The number of awards will depend on the merits of the proposals received and funds available. Multiple awards are possible in individual technical areas.

Q: Could tech area 2 data be shared with tech areas 1, 3, and 4 performers?
A: It is hoped that the PI meetings will foster an environment that allows for the sharing of results and data from across all the tech areas.

Q: Can the Human Subjects Research (HSR) protocol development and approval effort be conducted in the base period with an "option" to conduct HSR after all approvals are granted? Should the HSR option be separately priced?
A: This is an appropriate structure considering the contracting issues inherent in HSR protocol.

TECHNICAL

Q: Is my topic consistent with the objectives of the BAA?
A: DARPA is not able to suggest specific research approaches. If you feel that your chosen effort is consistent with the objectives of the BAA and capable of meeting the goals stated within the BAA, then you should feel free to propose them. It is strongly encouraged that you read the BAA carefully. It is your burden to make clear within your proposal that your approach is supportive of your innovative claims, and includes a detailed analysis of the technical motivation.

Q: Why does the suit have to be transparent? Does it mean "see through" or natural (not complicated)?
A: The term transparent refers to not interfering with a warfighter's activities; i.e. unnoticed by the user.

Q: You talk about "joint support" system and then say that you want to protect "soft tissue" and not through "rigid connections." This is not clear for the following reason: a "joint support system" will be deployed at joints that are "rigid." Am I missing something?
A: Rigid connections are not desirable as an overall means of load transfer to protect the joints, however it is understood that local rigid connections may be necessary on a per-technology basis.

Q: The battery weight constraint of 4.5 kg addresses what 24 hour mission? Is there a wearer, load or activity protocol that dictates this mission?
A: The suggested suit specifications are given as an aggressive baseline using an average soldier on level ground with a 45 kg load; final specifications for the integrated suit are TBD and are anticipated to be part of a subsequent BAA.

Q: How should performers working on hardware assess what level of simulation to propose? At what level will simulations developed for tech area #2 surpass our internal simulation work?

A: This is up to the proposer but it is expected that a certain level of modeling/simulation be used for validating a proposed technology over the regular course of development. To expand, it is hoped that the efforts under tech area #2 will eventually lead to an overall biomechanical simulation to assess meta-effects of technology such as impact on human metabolics, and that the individual technology models will feed into this.